

LARGE DEVIATIONS FOR FUNCTIONS OF TWO RANDOM PROJECTION MATRICES

FUMIO HIAI^{1,2} AND DÉNES PETZ^{1,3}

ABSTRACT. In this paper two independent and unitarily invariant projection matrices $P(N)$ and $Q(N)$ are considered and the large deviation is proven for the eigenvalue density of all polynomials of them as the matrix size N converges to infinity. The result is formulated on the tracial state space $TS(\mathcal{A})$ of the universal C^* -algebra $\mathcal{A}$ generated by two selfadjoint projections. The random pair $(P(N), Q(N))$ determines a random tracial state $\tau_N \in TS(\mathcal{A})$ and τ_N satisfies the large deviation. The rate function is in close connection with Voiculescu's free entropy defined for pairs of projections.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 15A52, 60F10, 46L54.

Key words: Eigenvalue density, large deviation, random matrices, free entropy, universal C^* -algebra, tracial state space.

INTRODUCTION

Large deviation results for the empirical eigenvalue density of random matrices started with the paper of Ben Arous and Guionnet [2] in which generalized Wigner theorem concerning Gaussian symmetric (or selfadjoint) matrices was proven. The paper was followed by large deviation results for several other kind of random matrices (as Wishart, etc); see the monograph [9] for a detailed discussion and the survey [8] for more recent developments.

Up to now the typical large deviation results on random matrices have dealt with the empirical eigenvalue density of a certain sequence of matrices; occasionally these matrices were algebraically expressed from two (as in [12]). In this paper two independent projection matrices are considered and the large deviation is proven for all polynomials (even for more general functions) of them. More precisely, the main result is a C^* -algebraic formulation of large deviations for the sequence of two random selfadjoint projection matrices $P(N)$ and $Q(N)$ having independent and unitarily invariant distribution provided moreover $\alpha := \lim_N \text{rank}(P(N))/N$ and $\beta := \lim_N \text{rank}(Q(N))/N$ exist. The main theorem is formulated on the tracial state space $TS(\mathcal{A})$ of the universal C^* -algebra $\mathcal{A} := C^*(\mathbb{Z} \star \mathbb{Z})$ generated by two selfadjoint projections e and f . The random pair $(P(N), Q(N))$ determines a random tracial state $\tau_N \in TS(\mathcal{A})$ as follows:

$$\tau_N(h) = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr}(\psi(h)), \quad h \in \mathcal{A},$$

where $\psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow M_N(\mathbb{C})$ is the unique $*$ -homomorphism such that $\psi(e) = P(N)$ and $\psi(f) = Q(N)$. The random τ_N induces a measure ν_N on $TS(\mathcal{A})$ and the sequence ν_N satisfies the large deviation principle in the scale $1/N^2$ with a rate function $\mathcal{I} : TS(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ in the ordinary sense. It is very remarkable that the rate function $\mathcal{I}$ is in close relation with

¹ Supported in part by Japan-Hungary JSPS-HAS Joint Project.

² Supported in part by Strategic Information and Communications R&D Promotion Scheme of MPHPT.

³ Supported in part by OTKA T032662.

Voiculescu's free entropy $\chi(p, q)$ defined for a pair of projections in a W^* -probability space. Namely, the GNS-construction from $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ yields a W^* -probability space $(\pi_\tau(\mathcal{A})'', \bar{\tau})$ and for the projections $p = \pi_\tau(e)$ and $q = \pi_\tau(f)$, we have $\mathcal{I}(\tau) = -\chi(p, q)$.

The result includes a bunch of traditional large deviation results for the eigenvalue density of different polynomials of $P(N)$ and $Q(N)$. The corresponding rate function can be obtained from $\mathcal{I}$ by the contraction principle and computed explicitly in some examples as $P(N)Q(N) + Q(N)P(N)$ and $aP(N) + bQ(N)$.

The paper is organized as follows. First we establish a large deviation theorem for the empirical eigenvalue density of the random matrix $P(N)Q(N)P(N)$. This result is obtained via the joint eigenvalue density and the cases $\alpha + \beta \leq 1$ and ≥ 1 are somewhat separated but treated parallel. A few facts about the Jacobi ensemble are used here. Since polynomials of two projections are easily controlled by the powers of $P(N)Q(N)P(N)$, we can move to the C^* -algebraic formulation mentioned above. The tracial state space $TS(\mathcal{A})$ has a convenient representation in terms of four numbers and a measure on $(0, 1)$. The large deviation theorem or more precisely the rate function is first identified in terms of the representation of tracial states and the description à la Voiculescu comes afterwards. The last section is the application of the contraction principle and contains very concrete computations.

1. JOINT DISTRIBUTION OF TWO PROJECTIONS

Let $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ be the algebra of $N \times N$ complex matrices. By an $N \times N$ *random projection matrix* P we always mean a random orthogonal (or selfadjoint) projection matrix, and the *unitary invariance* of P means that the distribution of VPV^* is equal to that of P for any unitary $V \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$.

The aim of this section is to analyze the joint distribution of two independent and unitarily invariant random projection matrices P, Q in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$, when their ranks $\text{rank}(P) = k$ and $\text{rank}(Q) = l$ are fixed; we may assume that $0 \leq k \leq l \leq N$. Throughout this section, we keep these assumptions on P and Q .

The joint eigenvalue distribution of PQP is related to the Jacobi ensemble. Let (A, B) be an independent pair of $N \times N$ complex *Wishart matrices* of p degrees of freedom and of q degrees of freedom, respectively, that is, $A = YY^*$ and $B = ZZ^*$ with complex $N \times p$ and $N \times q$ random matrices Y and Z such that $\text{Re } Y_{ij}$, $\text{Im } Y_{ij}$, $\text{Re } Z_{ij}$ and $\text{Im } Z_{ij}$ are independent standard Gaussians. Assume here that $p, q \geq N$. Then the random positive semidefinite matrix

$$(A + B)^{-1/2} A (A + B)^{-1/2}$$

is called an $N \times N$ *Jacobi ensemble* of parameter $(p - N, q - N)$. It has the probability distribution

$$\text{Constant} \times \text{Det}(X)^{p-N} \text{Det}(I - X)^{q-N} \mathbf{1}_{\{0 \leq X \leq I\}}(X) dX \quad (1.1)$$

on the space of $N \times N$ selfadjoint matrices (see [4, Lemma 2.1]), where $\mathbf{1}_{\{0 \leq X \leq I\}}$ denotes the characteristic function of $\{X \in M_N(\mathbb{C}) : 0 \leq X \leq I\}$. The density formula (1.1) implies the joint distribution of the eigenvalues

$$\text{Constant} \times \prod_{i=1}^N x_i^{p-N} (1 - x_i)^{q-N} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} (x_i - x_j)^2 \prod_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(x_i) dx_i,$$

see also [5] or [7, Chapter 2].

The next lemma is from [4, Theorem 2.2].

Lemma 1.1. *Assume that $k + l \leq N$. Then PQP , when considered as a random matrix in $M_k(\mathbb{C}) = PM_N(\mathbb{C})P$, has the distribution of a Jacobi ensemble of parameter $(l - k, N - k - l)$. Hence, the joint eigenvalue distribution of the nonzero eigenvalues of PQP is given by*

$$\frac{1}{Z_{N,k,l}} \prod_{i=1}^k x_i^{l-k} (1 - x_i)^{N-k-l} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (x_i - x_j)^2 \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(x_i) dx_i \quad (1.2)$$

with a normalization constant $Z_{N,k,l}$.

Let (A, B) and (A', B') be pairs of selfadjoint $N \times N$ random matrices. We say that they have the same *joint distribution* if

$$\text{tr}_N(h(A, B)) = \text{tr}_N(h(A', B')) \quad \text{almost surely}$$

for any polynomial h of two non-commuting variables, where tr_N denotes the normalized trace on $M_N(\mathbb{C})$.

Our strategy is to modify the pair (P, Q) of projections in such a way that they are easy to handle but their joint distribution does not change. As the first step, we may assume that (P, Q) are of the forms

$$P = I_k \oplus 0_{N-k}, \quad Q = U(I_l \oplus 0_{N-l})U^*,$$

where $I_k \oplus 0_{N-k}$ stands for the diagonal matrix whose k first diagonal entries are 1 and the remaining are 0, and U is an $N \times N$ Haar-distributed random unitary matrix. In this way, randomness belongs to only Q , while P is a constant projection matrix.

Proposition 1.2.

(a) *If $k + l \leq N$, then the joint distribution of (P, Q) coincides with that of the pair*

$$P \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} X & \sqrt{X(I_k - X)} & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{X(I_k - X)} & I_k - X & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_{l-k} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0_{N-k-l} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $X := \text{Diag}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ and $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in [0, 1]^k$ is distributed under the distribution (1.2).

(b) *If $k + l > N$, then the joint distribution of (P, Q) coincides with that of the pair*

$$P \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} I_{k+l-N} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & X & \sqrt{X(I_{N-l} - X)} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{X(I_{N-l} - X)} & I_{N-l} - X & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_{l-k} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $X := \text{Diag}(x_1, \dots, x_{N-l})$ and $(x_1, \dots, x_{N-l})$ in $[0, 1]^{N-l}$ is distributed under

$$\frac{1}{Z_{N,k,l}} \prod_{i=1}^{N-l} x_i^{l-k} (1 - x_i)^{k+l-N} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq N-l} (x_i - x_j)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{N-l} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(x_i) dx_i. \quad (1.3)$$

Proof. (a) Assume $k+l \leq N$. By the structure theorem of two projections (see [14, pp. 306–308]), after a (random) unitary conjugation, (P, Q) can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \oplus I \oplus I \oplus 0 \oplus 0, \\ Q &= \begin{bmatrix} X & \sqrt{X(I-X)} \\ \sqrt{X(I-X)} & I-X \end{bmatrix} \oplus I \oplus 0 \oplus I \oplus 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $0 \leq X \leq I$ with $\ker X = \{0\}$ and $\ker(I-X) = \{0\}$ on $\mathcal{H}_0$, under a decomposition

$$\mathbb{C}^N = (\mathcal{H}_0 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2) \oplus \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \oplus \mathcal{H}_3 \oplus \mathcal{H}_4.$$

(Note that $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3$ and $\mathcal{H}_4$ are the ranges of $P \wedge Q, P \wedge Q^\perp, P^\perp \wedge Q$ and $(P \vee Q)^\perp$, respectively, and some of them may be zero spaces.) Since $PQP|_{P\mathbb{C}^N}$ is $X \oplus I \oplus 0$ on $\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$, it follows from Lemma 1.1 that $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are zero spaces almost surely. This shows that there exists an $N \times N$ random unitary matrix V such that

$$\begin{aligned} VPV^* &= P = \begin{bmatrix} I_k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \oplus 0_{l-k} \oplus 0_{N-k-l}, \\ VQV^* &= \begin{bmatrix} X & \sqrt{X(I_k-X)} \\ \sqrt{X(I_k-X)} & I_k-X \end{bmatrix} \oplus I_{l-k} \oplus 0_{N-k-l}, \end{aligned}$$

where $X = \text{Diag}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ and $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in [0, 1]^k$ is distributed under (1.2) by Lemma 1.1. Hence we have the desired conclusion.

(b) Next, assume $k+l > N$; then since $N-l < k$ and $(N-l) + k \leq N$, one can apply the above case (a) to $(I-Q, P)$ instead of (P, Q) . Thus, the joint distribution of $(I-Q, P)$ is almost surely equal to that of the pair

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_{N-l} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \oplus 0_{k+l-N} \oplus 0_{l-k}$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} X & \sqrt{X(I_{N-l}-X)} \\ \sqrt{X(I_{N-l}-X)} & I_{N-l}-X \end{bmatrix} \oplus I_{n+m-N} \oplus 0_{m-n}$$

so that (P, Q) has the same joint distribution almost surely as the pair

$$\begin{bmatrix} X & \sqrt{X(I_{N-l}-X)} \\ \sqrt{X(I_{N-l}-X)} & I_{N-l}-X \end{bmatrix} \oplus I_{k+l-N} \oplus 0_{l-k}$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{N-l} \end{bmatrix} \oplus I_{k+l-N} \oplus I_{l-k}.$$

Here, $X = \text{Diag}(x_1, \dots, x_{N-l})$ and $(x_1, \dots, x_{N-l}) \in [0, 1]^{N-l}$ is distributed under

$$\frac{1}{Z_{N,N-l,k}} \prod_{i=1}^{N-l} x_i^{k+l-N} (1-x_i)^{l-k} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq N-l} (x_i - x_j)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{N-l} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(x_i) dx_i. \quad (1.4)$$

Since $\begin{bmatrix} X & \sqrt{X(I_{N-l}-X)} \\ \sqrt{X(I_{N-l}-X)} & I_{N-l}-X \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{N-l} \end{bmatrix}$ are respectively transformed into $\begin{bmatrix} I_{N-l} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} I_{N-l}-X & \sqrt{X(I_{N-l}-X)} \\ \sqrt{X(I_{N-l}-X)} & X \end{bmatrix}$ by a conjugation by the unitary matrix

$\begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{X} & \sqrt{I_{N-l}-X} \\ -\sqrt{I_{N-l}-X} & \sqrt{X} \end{bmatrix}$, the conclusion follows after the coordinate change $X \mapsto I_{N-l}-X$ so that (1.4) is transformed into (1.3). $\square$

From Proposition 1.2 we can readily obtain joint eigenvalue distributions of some polynomials of P and Q . For example, we have:

Corollary 1.3.

(i-a) When $k+l \leq N$, the eigenvalues of PQP (or PQ) are given as

$$\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{N-k \text{ times}}, x_1, \dots, x_k$$

and the joint distribution of $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is (1.2).

(i-b) When $k+l > N$, the eigenvalues of PQP (or PQ) are given as

$$\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{N-k \text{ times}}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{k+l-N \text{ times}}, x_1, \dots, x_{N-l},$$

and the joint distribution of $(x_1, \dots, x_{N-l})$ is (1.3).

(ii-a) When $k+l \leq N$, the eigenvalues of $PQ + QP$ are given as

$$\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{N-2k \text{ times}}, x_1 \pm \sqrt{x_1}, \dots, x_k \pm \sqrt{x_k}$$

and the joint distribution of $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is (1.2).

(ii-b) When $k+l > N$, the eigenvalues of $PQ + QP$ are given as

$$\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{l-k \text{ times}}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{k+l-N \text{ times}}, x_1 \pm \sqrt{x_1}, \dots, x_{N-l} \pm \sqrt{x_{N-l}},$$

and the joint distribution of $(x_1, \dots, x_{N-l})$ is (1.3).

(iii-a) When $k+l \leq N$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, the eigenvalues of $aP + bQ$ are given as

$$\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{N-2k \text{ times}}, \underbrace{b, \dots, b}_{l-k \text{ times}}, x_1, \dots, x_k, a+b-x_1, \dots, a+b-x_k,$$

and the joint distribution of $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2^k}{|ab|^{k(N-k)} Z_{N,k,l}} \prod_{i=1}^k \left| x_i - \frac{a+b}{2} \right| |(x_i - a)(x_i - b)|^{l-k} |x_i(a+b-x_i)|^{N-k-l} \\ & \times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} (x_i - x_j)^2 (a+b-x_i-x_j)^2 \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{[A,B]}(x_i) dx_i, \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

where $Z_{N,k,l}$ is the normalization constant in (1.2) and A, B are the first two smallest numbers of $0, a, b, a+b$.

(iii-b) When $k+l > N$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, the eigenvalues of $aP + bQ$ are given as

$$\underbrace{b, \dots, b}_{l-k \text{ times}}, \underbrace{a+b, \dots, a+b}_{k+l-N \text{ times}}, x_1, \dots, x_{N-l}, a+b-x_1, \dots, a+b-x_{N-l},$$

and the joint distribution of $(x_1, \dots, x_{N-l})$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2^{N-l}}{|ab|^{l(N-l)} Z_{N,k,l}} \prod_{i=1}^{N-l} \left| x_i - \frac{a+b}{2} \right| |(x_i - a)(x_i - b)|^{l-k} |x_i(a+b-x_i)|^{k+l-N} \\ & \times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq N-l} (x_i - x_j)^2 (a+b-x_i-x_j)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{N-l} \mathbf{1}_{[A,B]}(x_i) dx_i, \end{aligned}$$

where $Z_{N,k,l}$ is the normalization constant in (1.3) and A, B are as in (iii-a).

Proof. (i-a) is Lemma 1.1 and (i-b) is immediate from Proposition 1.2 (b).

(ii-a) By Proposition 1.2 (a) we may assume that

$$PQ + QP = \begin{bmatrix} 2X & \sqrt{X(I_k - X)} \\ \sqrt{X(I_k - X)} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \oplus 0_{N-2k},$$

where X is as in Proposition 1.2 (a). Then the result immediately follows because the eigenvalues of the 2×2 matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 2x & \sqrt{x(1-x)} \\ \sqrt{x(1-x)} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$ are $x \pm \sqrt{x}$. The proof of (ii-b) is similar by Proposition 1.2 (b).

(iii-a) By Proposition 1.2 (a) we may assume that

$$aP + bQ = \begin{bmatrix} aI_k + bX & b\sqrt{X(I_k - X)} & 0 & 0 \\ b\sqrt{X(I_k - X)} & b(I_k - X) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & bI_{l-k} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0_{N-k-l} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues of the 2×2 matrix $\begin{bmatrix} a+bx & b\sqrt{x(1-x)} \\ b\sqrt{x(1-x)} & b(1-x) \end{bmatrix}$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$ are

$$\frac{a+b \pm \sqrt{(a-b)^2 + 4abx}}{2}.$$

Set $t_i := \frac{a+b-\sqrt{(a-b)^2+4abx_i}}{2}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then the eigenvalues of $aP + bQ$ are

$$\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{N-2k \text{ times}}, \underbrace{b, \dots, b}_{l-k \text{ times}}, t_1, \dots, t_k, a+b-t_1, \dots, a+b-t_k,$$

and $(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ is supported in $[A, B]^k$. By noting that

$$x_i = \frac{(t_i - a)(t_i - b)}{ab}, \quad 1 - x_i = \frac{t_i(a+b-t_i)}{ab}, \quad \frac{dx_i}{dt_i} = 2 \left(t_i - \frac{a+b}{2} \right),$$

the form (1.5) of the joint distribution of $(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ can be directly computed from (1.2). The proof of (iii-b) is similar. $\square$

2. LARGE DEVIATION FOR PQP

From now on, for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ let $(P(N), Q(N))$ be a pair of independent and unitarily invariant random projection matrices in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ with non-random ranks $k(N) := \text{rank}(P(N))$ and $l(N) := \text{rank}(Q(N))$. Throughout what follows, we assume that $k(N)/N \rightarrow \alpha$ and $l(N)/N \rightarrow \beta$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$. Our goal is to obtain a large deviation

theorem for the empirical eigenvalue density of $P(N)Q(N)P(N)$. Concerning large deviation theory, our general reference is [6], but [9] contains many matrix examples.

We have already observed that the two cases $\alpha + \beta \leq 1$ and $\alpha + \beta \geq 1$ are slightly different. To treat them parallel, we set

$$\begin{aligned} n_0(N) &:= N - \min\{k(N), l(N)\}, \quad n_1(N) := \max\{k(N) + l(N) - N, 0\}, \\ n(N) &:= N - n_0(N) - n_1(N) \quad (= \min\{k(N), l(N), N - k(N), N - l(N)\}). \end{aligned}$$

Then one can combine (i-a) and (i-b) of Corollary 1.3 to see that the eigenvalues of the $N \times N$ selfadjoint random matrix $P(N)Q(N)P(N)$ are

$$\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n_0(N) \text{ times}}, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n_1(N) \text{ times}}, x_1, \dots, x_{n(N)}$$

and the joint distribution of $(x_1, \dots, x_{n(N)})$ is

$$\frac{1}{Z(N)} \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} x_i^{|k(N)-l(N)|} (1-x_i)^{|k(N)+l(N)-N|} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n(N)} (x_i - x_j)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(x_i) dx_i \quad (2.1)$$

with a normalization constant $Z(N)$.

When $\mathcal{X}$ is a Polish space, let $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$ denote the set of all probability measures on $\mathcal{X}$, which becomes a Polish space with respect to weak topology. For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ let $\Sigma(\mu)$ be Voiculescu's *free entropy* (or the minus of the *logarithmic energy*) of μ defined by

$$\Sigma(\mu) := \iint \log |x - y| d\mu(x) d\mu(y)$$

(see [16] and [9, §5.3]). In particular, when μ is compactly supported, $\Sigma(\mu) \in [-\infty, +\infty)$ is well defined.

We first prove large deviation for the sequence of distributions (2.1) with slight modifications of notation.

Proposition 2.1. *For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ consider the distribution*

$$\frac{1}{Z(N)} \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} x_i^{\kappa(N)} (1-x_i)^{\lambda(N)} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n(N)} (x_i - x_j)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(x_i) dx_i \quad (2.2)$$

on $[0, 1]^{n(N)}$ with $n(N) \in \mathbb{N}$, $\kappa(N), \lambda(N) \in [0, \infty)$ and a normalization constant $Z(N)$. Assume that $n(N)/N \rightarrow \rho$, $\kappa(N)/N \rightarrow \kappa$ and $\lambda(N)/N \rightarrow \lambda$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\rho \in (0, \infty)$ and $\kappa, \lambda \in [0, \infty)$. Then:

- (1) The limit $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log Z(N)$ exists and it equals $\rho^2 B(\kappa/\rho, \lambda/\rho)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} B(s, t) &:= \frac{(1+s)^2}{2} \log(1+s) - \frac{s^2}{2} \log s + \frac{(1+t)^2}{2} \log(1+t) - \frac{t^2}{2} \log t \\ &\quad - \frac{(2+s+t)^2}{2} \log(2+s+t) + \frac{(1+s+t)^2}{2} \log(1+s+t) \end{aligned}$$

for $s, t \geq 0$.

- (2) When $(x_1, \dots, x_{n(N)})$ is distributed under (2.2), the empirical measure

$$\frac{\delta_{x_1} + \dots + \delta_{x_{n(N)}}}{n(N)} \quad (2.3)$$

satisfies the large deviation principle in the scale $1/N^2$ with the rate function

$$I(\mu) := -\rho^2 \Sigma(\mu) - \rho \int_0^1 (\kappa \log x + \lambda \log(1-x)) d\mu(x) + \rho^2 B\left(\frac{\kappa}{\rho}, \frac{\lambda}{\rho}\right) \quad (2.4)$$

for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1])$. Moreover, there exists a unique minimizer $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ of $I(\mu)$ with $I(\mu_0) = 0$.

Proof. (1) The Selberg integral formula (see [11, §17.1]) gives

$$\begin{aligned} Z(N) &= \int_{[0,1]^{n(N)}} \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} x_i^{\kappa(N)} (1-x_i)^{\lambda(N)} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n(N)} (x_i - x_j)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} dx_i \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{n(N)} \frac{\Gamma(j+1)\Gamma(j+\kappa(N))\Gamma(j+\lambda(N))}{\Gamma(2)\Gamma(j+n(N)+\kappa(N)+\lambda(N))}. \end{aligned}$$

By using the Stirling formula, under neglecting the small order $o(N)$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{N^2} \log Z(N) \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{n(N)} j \log j + \sum_{j=1}^{n(N)} (j + \kappa(n)) \log(j + \kappa(n)) + \sum_{j=1}^{n(N)} (j + \rho(n)) \log(j + \rho(n)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^{n(N)} (j + n + \kappa(n) + \rho(n)) \log(j + n + \kappa(n) + \rho(n)) \right\} \\ &= \frac{n(N)}{N^2} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{n(N)} \frac{j}{n(N)} \log \frac{j}{n(N)} + \sum_{j=1}^{n(N)} \left(\frac{j}{n(N)} + \frac{\kappa}{\rho} \right) \log \left(\frac{j}{n(N)} + \frac{\kappa}{\rho} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=1}^{n(N)} \left(\frac{j}{n(N)} + \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \right) \log \left(\frac{j}{n(N)} + \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{j=1}^{n(N)} \left(\frac{j}{n(N)} + 1 + \frac{\kappa}{\rho} + \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \right) \log \left(\frac{j}{n(N)} + 1 + \frac{\kappa}{\rho} + \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log Z(N) \\ &= \rho^2 \left\{ \int_0^1 x \log x dx + \int_0^1 \left(x + \frac{\kappa}{\rho} \right) \log \left(x + \frac{\kappa}{\rho} \right) dx + \int_0^1 \left(x + \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \right) \log \left(x + \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \right) dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_0^1 \left(x + 1 + \frac{\kappa}{\rho} + \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \right) \log \left(x + 1 + \frac{\kappa}{\rho} + \frac{\lambda}{\rho} \right) dx \right\} \\ &= \rho^2 B\left(\frac{\kappa}{\rho}, \frac{\lambda}{\rho}\right). \end{aligned}$$

(2) Denote the distribution (2.2) by $\nu_{n(N)}$ and define the probability measure P_N on $\mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ by

$$P_N(\Lambda) := \nu_{n(N)}(\{x \in [0, 1]^{n(N)} : \mu_x \in \Lambda\})$$

for Borel subsets Λ of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1])$, where μ_x denotes the empirical measure (2.3) for $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n(N)})$. Define the kernel functions on $[0, 1]^2$ as follows:

$$F(x, y) := -\log|x - y| - \frac{\kappa}{2\rho}(\log x + \log y) - \frac{\lambda}{2\rho}(\log(1 - x) + \log(1 - y)),$$

$$F_R(x, y) := \min\{F(x, y), R\} \quad \text{for } R > 0.$$

Furthermore, for each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_N(x, y) &:= -\log|x - y| - \delta_{\kappa>0} \frac{\kappa(N)}{2n(N)}(\log x + \log y) \\ &\quad - \delta_{\lambda>0} \frac{\lambda(N)}{2n(N)}(\log(1 - x) + \log(1 - y)), \end{aligned}$$

$$\tilde{F}_{N,R}(x, y) := \min\{\tilde{F}_N(x, y), R\} \quad \text{for } R > 0,$$

where $\delta_{\kappa>0} = 1$ if $\kappa > 0$, $\delta_{\kappa>0} = 0$ if $\kappa = 0$, and $\delta_{\lambda>0}$ is similar. Then we observe the following:

- (i) $\tilde{F}_{N,R}(x, y) \leq -\log|x - y| - \frac{\kappa(n)}{2n(N)}(\log x + \log y) - \frac{\lambda(n)}{2n(N)}(\log(1 - x) + \log(1 - y))$ for all $x, y \in [0, 1]$.
- (ii) For any $R > 0$, $\tilde{F}_{N,R}(x, y)$ converges to $F_R(x, y)$ uniformly for $x, y \in [0, 1]$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

In fact, (i) is obvious by the definition of $\tilde{F}_{N,R}(x, y)$. For (ii) assume that $\kappa, \lambda > 0$ (the proof is similar for other cases). For $\delta > 0$ set

$$T_\delta := \{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 : \delta \leq x \leq 1 - \delta, \delta \leq y \leq 1 - \delta, |x - y| \geq \delta\}.$$

For any $R > 0$ there exist $\delta > 0$ and $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $F(x, y) \geq R$ and $\tilde{F}_N(x, y) \geq R$ for all $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 \setminus T_\delta$ and $N \geq N_0$. Obviously, $\tilde{F}_N(x, y)$ converges to $F(x, y)$ uniformly on T_δ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and the assertion follows.

According to general theory of large deviations ([6]), the stated large deviation is shown when we prove the following two inequalities for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1])$:

$$\inf_G \left[\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log P_N(G) \right] \leq -\rho^2 \iint F(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) - C, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\inf_G \left[\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log P_N(G) \right] \geq -\rho^2 \iint F(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) - C, \quad (2.6)$$

where $C := \rho^2 B(\kappa/\rho, \lambda/\rho)$ and G runs over neighborhoods of μ .

Proof of (2.5). For every neighborhood G of $\mu \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1])$, setting $\tilde{G} := \{x \in [0, 1]^{n(N)} : \mu_x \in G\}$, by the above (i) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P_N(G) &= \nu_{n(N)}(\tilde{G}) \\
&= \frac{1}{Z(N)} \int_{\tilde{G}} \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} x_i^{\kappa(N)} (1 - x_i)^{\lambda(N)} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n(N)} (x_i - x_j)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} dx_i \\
&\leq \frac{1}{Z(N)} \int_{\tilde{G}} \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} x_i^{\kappa(N)/n(N)} (1 - x_i)^{\lambda(N)/n(N)} \\
&\quad \times \exp\left(-2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n(N)} \tilde{F}_{N,R}(x_i, x_j)\right) \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} dx_i \\
&\leq \frac{1}{Z(N)} \left(\int_0^1 x^{\kappa(N)/n(N)} (1 - x)^{\lambda(N)/n(N)} dx \right)^{n(N)} \\
&\quad \times \exp\left(-n(N)^2 \inf_{\mu' \in G} \iint \tilde{F}_{N,R}(x, y) d\mu'(x) d\mu'(y) + n(N)R\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the above fact (ii) implies that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\inf_{\mu' \in G} \iint \tilde{F}_{N,R}(x, y) d\mu'(x) d\mu'(y) \right) = \inf_{\mu' \in G} \iint F_R(x, y) d\mu'(x) d\mu'(y),$$

we get

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log P_N(G) \leq -\rho^2 \inf_{\mu' \in G} \iint F_R(x, y) d\mu'(x) d\mu'(y) - C$$

thanks to (1). Furthermore, appealing to the continuity of $\mu' \mapsto \iint F_R(x, y) d\mu'(x) d\mu'(y)$, we obtain

$$\inf_G \left[\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log P_N(G) \right] \leq -\rho^2 \iint F_R(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) - C$$

so that (2.5) follows by letting $R \rightarrow +\infty$.

Proof of (2.6). If μ has an atom at 0 or 1, then $\iint F(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) = +\infty$ so that we have nothing to do. Otherwise, letting $d\mu_\delta(x) := \mu([\delta, 1 - \delta])^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{[\delta, 1 - \delta]}(x) d\mu(x)$, we get

$$\iint F(x, y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) = \lim_{\delta \searrow 0} \iint F(x, y) d\mu_\delta(x) d\mu_\delta(y).$$

Also it is immediate to see that

$$\mu \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]) \mapsto \inf \left\{ \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log P_N(G) : G \text{ is a neighborhood of } \mu \right\}$$

is upper semicontinuous. Hence we may assume that μ is supported in $[a, b]$ with $0 < a < b < 1$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ let $\phi_\varepsilon \geq 0$ be a C^∞ -function supported in $[-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$ such that $\int \phi_\varepsilon(x) dx = 1$. Then we get $\Sigma(\phi_\varepsilon * \mu) \geq \Sigma(\mu)$ (see [9, p. 216]) as well as

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \int \log x d(\phi_\varepsilon * \mu)(x) &= \int \log x d\mu(x), \\
\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \int \log(1 - x) d(\phi_\varepsilon * \mu)(x) &= \int \log(1 - x) d\mu(x)
\end{aligned}$$

so that μ may be assumed to have a continuous density. Furthermore, by the concavity of $\Sigma(\mu)$, it suffices to prove (2.6) for $(1 - \varepsilon)\mu + \varepsilon m$ for each $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, where m is the uniform measure on an interval including the support $\text{supp } \mu$. After all, we can assume that μ has a continuous density $f > 0$ on $\text{supp } \mu = [a, b]$ with $0 < a < b < 1$ and $\delta \leq f(x) \leq \delta^{-1}$ on $[a, b]$ for some $\delta > 0$.

For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$a < a_1^{(N)} < b_1^{(N)} < a_2^{(N)} < \cdots < a_{n(N)}^{(N)} < b_{n(N)}^{(N)}$$

be such that

$$\int_a^{a_i^{(N)}} f(x) dx = \frac{i - \frac{1}{2}}{n(N)}, \quad \int_a^{b_i^{(N)}} f(x) dx = \frac{i}{n(N)}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n(N);$$

then

$$b_i^{(N)} - a_i^{(N)} \geq \frac{\delta}{2n(N)}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n(N).$$

Define

$$\Delta_{n(N)} := \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n(N)}) \in [0, 1]^{n(N)} : a_i^{(N)} \leq x_i \leq b_i^{(N)}, 1 \leq i \leq n(N)\}.$$

For any neighborhood G of μ , whenever N is large enough, we have

$$\Delta_{n(N)} \subset \tilde{G} := \{x \in [0, 1]^{n(N)} : \mu_x \in G\}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} P_N(G) &= \nu_{n(N)}(\tilde{G}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{Z(N)} \int_{\Delta_{n(N)}} \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} x_i^{\kappa(N)} (1 - x_i)^{\lambda(N)} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n(N)} (x_i - x_j)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} dx_i \\ &\geq \frac{1}{Z(N)} \left(\frac{\delta}{2n(N)} \right)^{n(N)} \prod_{i=1}^{n(N)} (a_i^{(N)})^{\kappa(N)} (1 - b_i^{(N)})^{\lambda(N)} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n(N)} (a_j^{(N)} - b_i^{(N)})^2. \end{aligned}$$

With $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [a, b]$ being the inverse function of $t \in [a, b] \mapsto \int_a^t f(x) dx$, since $a_i^{(N)} = g((i - \frac{1}{2})/n(N))$ and $b_i^{(N)} = g(i/n(N))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\kappa(N)}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n(N)} \log a_i^{(N)} &= \rho \kappa \int_0^1 \log g(t) dt = \rho \kappa \int \log x d\mu(x), \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\kappa(N)}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n(N)} \log(1 - b_i^{(N)}) &= \rho \kappa \int_0^1 \log(1 - g(t)) dt = \rho \kappa \int \log(1 - x) d\mu(x), \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n(N)} \log(a_j^{(N)} - b_i^{(N)}) &= 2\rho^2 \iint_{0 \leq s < t \leq 1} \log(g(t) - g(s)) ds dt = \rho^2 \Sigma(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

These estimates altogether imply (2.6).

The proof of the large deviation is now completed, and the existence of a unique minimizer of the rate function is known as a general result on weighted logarithmic energy functionals (see [13, I.1.3]). $\square$

Now, the large deviation theorem for the random matrix $P(N)Q(N)P(N)$ can be easily shown from Proposition 2.1. Set

$$\rho := \min\{\alpha, \beta, 1 - \alpha, 1 - \beta\}, \quad (2.7)$$

$$C := \rho^2 B\left(\frac{|\alpha - \beta|}{\rho}, \frac{|\alpha + \beta - 1|}{\rho}\right) \quad (2.8)$$

(meant zero if $\rho = 0$), and denote by $\mathcal{M}((0, 1))$ the set of all probability measures on $[0, 1]$ with no atoms at 0 and 1.

Theorem 2.2. *The empirical eigenvalue density of $P(N)Q(N)P(N)$ satisfies the large deviation principle in the scale $1/N^2$ with the rate function $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$ for $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ given as follows: If*

$$\tilde{\mu} = (1 - \min\{\alpha, \beta\})\delta_0 + \max\{\alpha + \beta - 1, 0\}\delta_1 + \rho\mu$$

with $\mu \in \mathcal{M}((0, 1))$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu}) := & -\rho^2 \Sigma(\mu) - \rho|\alpha - \beta| \int_0^1 \log x \, d\mu(x) \\ & - \rho|\alpha + \beta - 1| \int_0^1 \log(1 - x) \, d\mu(x) + C; \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

otherwise $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu}) = +\infty$. Moreover, a unique minimizer of $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$ is given by

$$\tilde{\mu}_0 := (1 - \min\{\alpha, \beta\})\delta_0 + \max\{\alpha + \beta - 1, 0\}\delta_1 + \frac{\sqrt{(x - \xi)(\eta - x)}}{2\pi x(1 - x)} \mathbf{1}_{(\xi, \eta)}(x) \, dx \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$\xi, \eta := \alpha + \beta - 2\alpha\beta \pm \sqrt{4\alpha\beta(1 - \alpha)(1 - \beta)}. \quad (2.11)$$

In particular, when $\rho = 0$, $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$ is identically $+\infty$ except at only $\tilde{\mu}_0 = (1 - \min\{\alpha, \beta\})\delta_0 + \max\{\alpha + \beta - 1, 0\}\delta_1$.

Proof. From the fact mentioned at the beginning of the section, the empirical eigenvalue density of $P(N)Q(N)P(N)$ is given by

$$\tilde{R}_N := \frac{n_0(N)}{N}\delta_0 + \frac{n_1(N)}{N}\delta_1 + \frac{n(N)}{N}R_N,$$

where $R_N := \frac{1}{n(N)}(\delta_{x_1} + \dots + \delta_{x_{n(N)}})$ and the joint distribution of $(x_1, \dots, x_{n(N)})$ is (2.1). First, assume that $\rho > 0$. Proposition 2.1 says that (R_N) satisfies the large deviation in the scale $1/N^2$ with the rate function $I(\mu)$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ given in (2.4) with $\kappa := |\alpha - \beta|$ and $\lambda := |\alpha + \beta - 1|$. We now proceed as in the proof of [9, 5.5.11]. Let P_N and $\tilde{P}_N$ be the distributions on $\mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ of R_N and $\tilde{R}_N$, respectively; then

$$\tilde{P}_N(\Lambda) = P_N\left(\left\{\mu \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]) : \frac{n_0(N)}{n}\delta_0 + \frac{n_1(N)}{N}\delta_1 + \frac{n(N)}{N}\mu \in \Lambda\right\}\right)$$

for $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{M}([0, 1])$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ denote the set $\{\rho_0\delta_0 + \rho_1\delta_1 + \rho\mu : \mu \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1])\}$, where $\rho_0 := 1 - \min\{\alpha, \beta\}$ and $\rho_1 := \max\{\alpha + \beta - 1, 0\}$. If $\tilde{\mu} \notin \mathcal{D}$, then $\tilde{\mu}(\{0\}) < \rho_0$ or $\tilde{\mu}(\{1\}) < \rho_1$ so that letting $\tilde{\mu}(\{0\}) < \varepsilon < \rho_0$ (or $\tilde{\mu}(\{1\}) < \varepsilon < \rho_1$) we have a neighborhood $\tilde{G} := \{\mu' \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]) : \mu'(\{0\}) < \varepsilon \text{ (or } \mu'(\{1\}) < \varepsilon)\}$ of μ . Since $\tilde{P}_N(\tilde{G}) = 0$ for large N , we get $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \tilde{P}_N(\tilde{G}) = -\infty$. Next, assume that $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\tilde{\mu} = \rho_0\delta_0 + \rho_1\delta_1 + \rho\mu$. For any

neighborhood $\tilde{G}$ of $\tilde{\mu}$ there exists a neighborhood G of μ such that $\frac{n_0(N)}{N}\delta_0 + \frac{n_1(N)}{N}\delta_1 + \frac{n(N)}{N}G \subset \tilde{G}$ for large N and hence

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \tilde{P}_N(\tilde{G}) \geq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log P_N(G) \geq -I(\mu).$$

On the other hand, for any neighborhood G of μ there exists a neighborhood $\tilde{G}$ of $\tilde{\mu}$ such that

$$\left(\frac{N}{n(N)}\tilde{G} - \frac{n_0(N)}{n(N)}\delta_0 - \frac{n_1(N)}{n(N)}\delta_1 \right) \cap \mathcal{M}([0, 1]) \subset G,$$

that is,

$$\left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]) : \frac{n_0(N)}{n}\delta_0 + \frac{n_1(N)}{n}\delta_1 + \frac{n(N)}{n}\mu \in \tilde{G} \right\} \subset G$$

for large N . Therefore,

$$\inf_{\tilde{G}} \left[\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \log \tilde{P}_N(\tilde{G}) \right] \leq \inf_G \left[\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \log P_N(G) \right] \leq -I(\mu).$$

Noting that $\Sigma(\mu) = -\infty$ if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ has an atom at 0 or 1, we obtain the desired large deviation for $(\tilde{R}_N)$ when $\rho > 0$. The proof in the case $\rho = 0$ is similar to the above argument for $\tilde{\mu} \notin \mathcal{D}$.

Finally, the existence of a unique minimizer of $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$ is already known by Proposition 2.1. To obtain the explicit form of the minimizer, we may apply a standard method in free probability theory. In fact, by the *asymptotic freeness* due to Voiculescu [15, Theorem 3.11] (see also [9, 4.3.5]), the joint distribution of $(P(N), Q(N))$ converges to that of (p, q) where p and q are free projections in a tracial W^* -probability space $(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ with $\tau(p) = \alpha$ and $\tau(q) = \beta$. The computation by use of S -transform in [18] says that the measure (2.10) is the distribution measure of pqp ; hence it is the minimizer of $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$. $\square$

Note that the rate function $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$ is indeed lower semicontinuous and convex on $\mathcal{M}([0, 1])$, which is of course a good rate function because of the compactness of $\mathcal{M}([0, 1])$.

3. C^* -ALGEBRA FORMULATION

The two-dimensional commutative C^* -algebra $\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} = C^*(\mathbb{Z}_2)$ is the universal C^* -algebra generated by a single orthogonal projection; hence the universal C^* -algebra generated two orthogonal projections is

$$(\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}) \star (\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}) = C^*(\mathbb{Z} \star \mathbb{Z})$$

with projection generators $(1, 0)$'s in two components. As pointed out in [3, p. 14], one can see from the structure theorem for two projections ([14, pp. 306–308]) that $C^*(\mathbb{Z} \star \mathbb{Z})$ is isomorphic to an algebra of $M_2(\mathbb{C})$ -valued continuous functions on $[0, 1]$; namely

$$\mathcal{A} := \{a \in C([0, 1]; M_2(\mathbb{C})) : a(0) \text{ and } a(1) \text{ are diagonal}\},$$

where the corresponding two projection generators are represented as

$$e(t) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad f(t) := \begin{bmatrix} t & \sqrt{t(1-t)} \\ \sqrt{t(1-t)} & 1-t \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq 1.$$

We thus consider the above C^* -algebra $\mathcal{A}$ with generators e, f as the universal C^* -algebra generated by two projections. We denote by $TS(\mathcal{A})$ the set of all tracial states on $\mathcal{A}$, which

becomes a Polish space with respect to w^* -topology. The following lemma is a concrete description of $TS(\mathcal{A})$, the details are left to the reader.

Lemma 3.1. *For each $\tau \in TS(\mathcal{A})$ there exist $\alpha_{11}, \alpha_{10}, \alpha_{01}, \alpha_{00} \geq 0$ with $\sum_{i,j=0}^1 \alpha_{ij} \leq 1$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}((0,1))$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(a) &= \alpha_{10}a_1(0) + \alpha_{01}a_2(0) + \alpha_{11}a_1(1) + \alpha_{00}a_2(1) \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \sum_{i,j=0}^1 \alpha_{ij}\right) \int_0^1 \text{tr}(a(t)) d\mu(t) \end{aligned}$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ with $a(0) = \text{Diag}(a_1(0), a_2(0))$ and $a(1) = \text{Diag}(a_1(1), a_2(1))$.

In this way, the set $TS(\mathcal{A})$ is parameterized by the set of all $(\{\alpha_{ij}\}_{i,j=0}^1, \mu)$ of $\alpha_{ij} \geq 0$, $\sum_{i,j=0}^1 \alpha_{ij} \leq 1$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}((0,1))$, and we write $\tau = (\{\alpha_{ij}\}_{i,j=0}^1, \mu)$ under this parameterization. But, note that μ is irrelevant if $\sum_{i,j=0}^1 \alpha_{ij} = 1$. For $\tau = (\{\alpha_{ij}\}_{i,j=0}^1, \mu)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(e) &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha_{11} + \alpha_{10} - \alpha_{01} - \alpha_{00}), \\ \tau(f) &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha_{11} - \alpha_{10} + \alpha_{01} - \alpha_{00}). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, let π_τ be the GNS representation of $\mathcal{A}$ associated with τ and $\tilde{\tau}$ be the normal extension of τ to $\pi_\tau(\mathcal{A})''$. Then, for $p := \pi_\tau(e)$ and $q := \pi_\tau(f)$ in $\pi_\tau(\mathcal{A})''$ we have

$$\tilde{\tau}(p \wedge q) = \alpha_{11}, \quad \tilde{\tau}(p \wedge q^\perp) = \alpha_{10}, \quad \tilde{\tau}(p^\perp \wedge q) = \alpha_{01}, \quad \tilde{\tau}(p^\perp \wedge q^\perp) = \alpha_{00}. \quad (3.1)$$

For any two projections p, q in a tracial W^* -probability space $(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$, the universality property of $\mathcal{A}$ shows that there exists a (unique) $*$ -homomorphism $\psi_{p,q} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that $\psi_{p,q}(e) = p$ and $\psi_{p,q}(f) = q$. We simply write $h(p, q)$ for $\psi_{p,q}(h)$ for each $h \in \mathcal{A}$, which may be regarded as a sort of “noncommutative functional calculus.” Then a tracial state $\tau_{p,q} \in TS(\mathcal{A})$ is defined by $\tau_{p,q}(h) := \tau(h(p, q))$ for $h \in \mathcal{A}$. In particular, for $N \times N$ projection matrices P, Q , we have $\tau_{P,Q} \in TS(\mathcal{A})$ given by $\tau_{P,Q}(h) = \text{tr}_N(h(P, Q))$ for $h \in \mathcal{A}$. When P, Q are random projection matrices, $\tau_{P,Q}$ is a random tracial state on $\mathcal{A}$ regarded as the “noncommutative empirical measure” of the pair (P, Q) . Its *distribution measure* on $TS(\mathcal{A})$ is defined by

$$\nu(\Lambda) := \text{Prob}(\{\tau_{P,Q} \in \Lambda\})$$

for Borel subsets $\Lambda \subset TS(\mathcal{A})$, where Prob denotes probability measure of the underlying probability space where P, Q are defined.

We are now in a position to state our main large deviation result formulated on the tracial state space $TS(\mathcal{A})$.

Theorem 3.2. *For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ let $(P(N), Q(N))$ be a pair of independent and unitarily invariant random projection matrices in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\text{rank}(P(N))/N \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\text{rank}(Q(N))/N \rightarrow \beta$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Let ν_N be the distribution measure of the random tracial state $\tau_N := \tau_{P(N), Q(N)}$ on $TS(\mathcal{A})$. Then (ν_N) satisfies the large deviation principle in the scale $1/N^2$ with rate function*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(\tau) &:= -\rho^2 \Sigma(\mu) - \rho|\alpha - \beta| \int_0^1 \log x d\mu(x) \\ &\quad - \rho|\alpha + \beta - 1| \int_0^1 \log(1 - x) d\mu(x) + C \end{aligned}$$

evaluated at $\tau = (\{\alpha_{ij}\}_{i,j=0}^1, \mu) \in TS(\mathcal{A})$ if

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_{11} = \max\{\alpha + \beta - 1, 0\}, \\ \alpha_{00} = \max\{1 - \alpha - \beta, 0\}, \\ \alpha_{10} = \max\{\alpha - \beta, 0\}, \\ \alpha_{01} = \max\{\beta - \alpha, 0\}, \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

otherwise $\mathcal{I}(\tau) = +\infty$. (See (2.7) and (2.8) for constants ρ and C .)

Moreover, the unique minimizer of $\mathcal{I}$ is the tracial state $\tau_{p,q}$ corresponding to a pair (p, q) of free projections with trace values α and β .

Proof. First we notice that all mixed moments of e, f with respect to τ are listed as $\tau(e)$, $\tau(f)$ and

$$\tau((ef)^k) = \tau((fe)^k) = \tau((efe)^k) = \tau((fef)^k), \quad k \geq 1. \quad (3.3)$$

Since the moments $\tau((efe)^k)$, $k \geq 1$, determine the distribution of efe with respect to τ , one can define an affine homeomorphism Ψ of $TS(\mathcal{A})$ with w^* -topology into $[0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times \mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ with product topology by $\Psi(\tau) := (\tau(e), \tau(f), \tilde{\mu})$ where $\tilde{\mu}$ is the distribution measure of efe with respect to τ . For each $\tau = (\{\alpha_{ij}\}_{i,j=0}^1, \mu) \in TS(\mathcal{A})$ let $p := \pi_\tau(e)$ and $q := \pi_\tau(f)$ in $(\pi_\tau(\mathcal{A})'', \tilde{\tau})$, and let $e_{pqp}(\cdot)$ be the spectral measure of pqp . From the structure theorem for two projections, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}(\{0\}) &= \tilde{\tau}(e_{pqp}(\{0\})) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{1} - p \wedge q - p \wedge q^\perp - p^\perp \wedge q - p^\perp \wedge q^\perp) \\ &\quad + \tilde{\tau}(p \wedge q^\perp + p^\perp \wedge q + p^\perp \wedge q^\perp) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (1 - \alpha_{11} + \alpha_{10} + \alpha_{01} + \alpha_{00}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mu}(\{1\}) = \tilde{\tau}(e_{pqp}(\{1\})) = \tilde{\tau}(p \wedge q) = \alpha_{11}$$

thanks to (3.1). Hence it is straightforward to check that τ satisfies (3.2) if and only the following hold:

$$\begin{cases} \tau(e) = \alpha, \\ \tau(f) = \beta, \\ \tilde{\mu}(\{0\}) = 1 - \min\{\alpha, \beta\}, \\ \tilde{\mu}(\{1\}) = \max\{\alpha + \beta - 1, 0\}. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, in this case we obviously have

$$\tilde{\mu} = (1 - \min\{\alpha, \beta\})\delta_0 + \max\{\alpha + \beta - 1, 0\}\delta_1 + \rho\mu,$$

where

$$\rho = \min\{\alpha, \beta, 1 - \alpha, 1 - \beta\} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sum_{i,j=0}^1 \alpha_{ij} \right). \quad (3.4)$$

Based on Theorem 2.2 together with these facts, to show the theorem, it suffices to prove the following assertions:

(i) If $\tau \in TS(\mathcal{A})$ and $(\tau(e), \tau(f)) \neq (\alpha, \beta)$, then

$$\inf_G \left[\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \nu_N(G) \right] = -\infty.$$

(ii) If $\tau \in TS(\mathcal{A})$ and $\Psi(\tau) = (\alpha, \beta, \tilde{\mu})$, then

$$\inf_G \left[\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \nu_N(G) \right] \leq -\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu}),$$

$$\inf_G \left[\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \nu_N(G) \right] \geq -\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu}),$$

where $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$ is the rate function in Theorem 2.2 and G runs over neighborhoods of τ .

When $(\tau(e), \tau(f)) \neq (\alpha, \beta)$, choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon < |\tau(e) - \alpha|$ (or $\varepsilon < |\tau(f) - \beta|$), and set $G := \{\tau' \in TS(\mathcal{A}) : |\tau'(e) - \alpha| < \varepsilon \text{ (or } |\tau'(f) - \beta| < \varepsilon)\}$. Since $\tau_N(e) = \text{tr}_N(P(N)) = k(N)/N \rightarrow \alpha$ and $\tau_N(f) = \text{tr}_N(Q(N)) = l(N)/N \rightarrow \beta$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, we get $\nu_N(G) = 0$ for large N so that (i) follows.

To prove (ii), assume that $\Psi(\tau) = (\alpha, \beta, \tilde{\mu})$. For any neighborhood $\tilde{G}$ of $\tilde{\mu}$, note that $\Psi^{-1}([0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times \tilde{G})$ is a neighborhood of τ and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_N(\Psi^{-1}([0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times \tilde{G})) &= \text{Prob}(\{\Psi(\tau_N) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \times \tilde{G}\}) \\ &= \text{Prob}(\{\tilde{R}_N \in \tilde{G}\}) = \tilde{P}_N(\tilde{G}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{R}_N$ is the empirical eigenvalue distribution of $P(N)Q(N)P(N)$ and $\tilde{P}_N$ is its distribution on $\mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ (see the proof of Theorem 2.2). Hence we have

$$\inf_G \left[\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \nu_N(G) \right] \leq \inf_{\tilde{G}} \left[\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \tilde{P}_N(\tilde{G}) \right] \leq -\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$$

by Theorem 2.2. On the other hand, for any neighborhood G of τ , one can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ and a neighborhood $\tilde{G}$ of $\tilde{\mu}$ such that $\Psi^{-1}((\alpha - \varepsilon, \alpha + \varepsilon) \times (\beta - \varepsilon, \beta + \varepsilon) \times \tilde{G}) \subset G$, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \nu_N(G) &\geq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \nu_N(\Psi^{-1}((\alpha - \varepsilon, \alpha + \varepsilon) \times (\beta - \varepsilon, \beta + \varepsilon) \times \tilde{G})) \\ &= \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \text{Prob}(\{|\text{tr}_N(P(N)) - \alpha| < \varepsilon, |\text{tr}_N(Q(N)) - \beta| < \varepsilon, \tilde{R}_N \in \tilde{G}\}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\text{tr}_N(P(N)) - \alpha| < \varepsilon$ and $|\text{tr}_N(Q(N)) - \beta| < \varepsilon$ for large N (as in the proof of (i)), we have

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \nu_N(G) \geq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \tilde{P}_N(\tilde{G}) \geq -\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$$

by Theorem 2.2, and hence (ii) is proven. Finally, Theorem 2.2 proves the assertion on the minimizer as well (or this is a direct consequence of the asymptotic freeness of $(P(N), Q(N))$). $\square$

For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ let $\mathcal{P}(N, k)$ denote the set of all $N \times N$ orthogonal projection matrices of rank k , and $\gamma_{N, k}$ be the unitarily invariant measure on $\mathcal{P}(N, k)$. We note that $\mathcal{P}(N, k)$ is identified with the homogeneous space $U(N)/(U(k) \oplus U(N - k))$ (or the *Grassmannian manifold* $G(N, k)$) and $\gamma_{N, k}$ corresponds to the measure on that space induced from the Haar probability measure on the unitary group $U(N)$. In fact, an $N \times N$

unitarily invariant random projection matrix of rank k we have treated is standardly realized by $P \in \mathcal{P}(N, k)$ distributed under $\gamma_{N, k}$.

Let (p, q) be a pair of projections in a tracial W^* -probability space $(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ and let $\alpha := \tau(p)$ and $\beta := \tau(q)$. The *free entropy* $\chi(p, q)$ of (p, q) proposed in [17, 14.2] by Voiculescu is defined as follows: Choose sequences $k(N)$ and $l(N)$ such that $k(N)/N \rightarrow \alpha$ and $l(N)/N \rightarrow \beta$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ set

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(p, q; k(N), l(N); N, m, \varepsilon) \\ := \left\{ (P, Q) \in \mathcal{P}(N, k(N)) \times \mathcal{P}(N, l(N)) : \left| \text{tr}_N(P_1 \cdots P_m) - \tau(p_1 \cdots p_m) \right| < \varepsilon \right. \\ \left. \text{for all } (P_j, p_j) \in \{(P, p), (Q, q)\}, 1 \leq j \leq m \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and define

$$\chi(p, q) := \lim_{\substack{m \rightarrow \infty \\ \varepsilon \searrow 0}} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log(\gamma_{N, k(N)} \otimes \gamma_{N, l(N)}) \left(\Gamma(p, q; k(N), l(N); N, m, \varepsilon) \right). \quad (3.5)$$

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the C^* -algebra with two projection generators e, f introduced in the previous section. The *free entropy* of a tracial state $\tau \in TS(\mathcal{A})$ is defined as $\chi(\pi_\tau(e), \pi_\tau(f))$ in the tracial W^* -probability space $(\pi_\tau(\mathcal{A})'', \tilde{\tau})$ obtained via the GNS construction associated with τ .

Next we identify the rate function in Theorem 3.2 as the free entropy $\chi(\tau)$ (up to a sign).

Proposition 3.3. *The rate function in Theorem 3.2 given for $\alpha = \tau(e)$ and $\beta = \tau(f)$ is*

$$\mathcal{I}(\tau) = -\chi(\tau).$$

Moreover $\limsup$ can be replaced by $\lim$ in definition (3.5).

Proof. Let $p := \pi_\tau(e)$, $q := \pi_\tau(f)$ and $\tilde{\mu}$ be the distribution of efe with respect to τ . In view of the form (3.3) of joint moments of e, f and the choices of $k(N), l(N)$ as above, one can easily see that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(p, q; k(N), l(N); N, 2m, \varepsilon) \\ = \left\{ (P, Q) \in \mathcal{P}(N, k(N)) \times \mathcal{P}(N, l(N)) : \left| \text{tr}_N((PQP)^k) - \tau((efe)^k) \right| < \varepsilon, 1 \leq k \leq m \right\} \end{aligned}$$

whenever N is large enough. This implies that

$$(\gamma_{N, k(N)} \otimes \gamma_{N, l(N)}) \left(\Gamma(p, q; k(N), l(N); N, 2m, \varepsilon) \right) = \tilde{P}_N(\tilde{G}(m, \varepsilon)),$$

where $\tilde{P}_N$ is the distribution on $\mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ mentioned in the proof of Theorem 3.2 and $\tilde{G}(m, \varepsilon)$ is a neighborhood of $\tilde{\mu}$ given by

$$\tilde{G}(m, \varepsilon) := \left\{ \tilde{\mu}' \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1]) : \left| \int x^k d\tilde{\mu}'(x) - \int x^k d\tilde{\mu}(x) \right| < \varepsilon, 1 \leq k \leq m \right\}.$$

Now, as in the proof of [9, 5.6.2] we have the limit

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log(\gamma_{N, k(N)} \otimes \gamma_{N, l(N)}) \left(\Gamma(p, q; k(N), l(N); N, 2m, \varepsilon) \right) \\ = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \log \tilde{P}_N(\tilde{G}(m, \varepsilon)), \end{aligned}$$

and the conclusion follows from Theorem 3.2 and its proof. $\square$

Theorem 3.2 implies that the free entropy $\chi(p, q)$ of two projections p, q admits a maximal value, i.e., $\chi(p, q) = 0$ if and only if p, q are free. Moreover, note by Proposition 3.3 that the definition (3.5) of $\chi(p, q)$ is independent of the choices of sequences $k(N)$ and $l(N)$, but this fact is easy to directly verify.

A further study of the free entropy $\chi(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ for general n -tuples of projections as well as some related topics will be in a forthcoming paper [10].

4. APPLICATIONS OF THE CONTRACTION PRINCIPLE

Let $(P(N), Q(N))$ be as before, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be the C^* -algebra of two projection generators introduced in the previous section. Our large deviation in Theorem 3.2 is formulated on the tracial state space of $\mathcal{A}$. The aim of this section is to exemplify how Theorem 3.2 implies, via the contraction principle, the large deviation for the empirical eigenvalue density of various random matrices made from $(P(N), Q(N))$.

For each selfadjoint element $h \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tau \in TS(\mathcal{A})$, let $\lambda_h(\tau)$ denote the distribution measure of h with respect to τ . Fixing h we then have a map $\lambda_h : TS(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$; in fact, $\lambda_h(\tau) \in \mathcal{M}([-\|h\|, \|h\|])$ for every $\tau \in TS(\mathcal{A})$. It is straightforward to see that λ_h is continuous with respect to w^* -topology on $TS(\mathcal{A})$ and weak topology on $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$. Let $\tau_N := \tau_{P(N), Q(N)}$ be the random tracial state on $\mathcal{A}$ induced by $(P(N), Q(N))$ and ν_N the distribution on $TS(\mathcal{A})$ of τ_N (see Section 3). We then notice that

$$\nu_N \circ \lambda_h^{-1}(\Lambda) = \text{Prob}(\{\tau_N \in \lambda_h^{-1}(\Lambda)\}) = \text{Prob}(\{\lambda_h(\tau_N) \in \Lambda\})$$

for Borel sets $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$. Since

$$\int x^m d\lambda_h(\tau_N)(x) = \tau_N(h^m) = \text{tr}_N(h(P(N), Q(N))^m), \quad m \in \mathbb{N},$$

it follows that $\lambda_h(\tau_N)$ is nothing but the empirical eigenvalue distribution of an $N \times N$ selfadjoint random matrix $h(P(N), Q(N))$ (via “noncommutative functional calculus” mentioned in Section 3). Therefore, by the *contraction principle* (see [6, 4.2.1]), Theorem 3.2 implies the following:

Theorem 4.1. *For every selfadjoint element $h \in \mathcal{A}$, the empirical eigenvalue distribution of $h(P(N), Q(N))$ satisfies the large deviation principle in the scale $1/N^2$ with the good rate function*

$$I_h(\mu) := \inf\{\mathcal{I}(\tau) : \tau \in TS(\mathcal{A}), \lambda_h(\tau) = \mu\}$$

for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$, and $\mu_0 := \lambda_h(\tau_0)$ is a unique minimizer of I_h , where $\mathcal{I}$ and τ_0 are as in Theorem 3.2.

Remark 4.2. For any unitary $u \in \mathcal{A}$ define a map $\lambda_u : TS(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T})$, $\mathbb{T}$ being the unit circle, by letting $\lambda_u(\tau)$ the distribution of u with respect to τ . Then a similar large deviation is satisfied for the empirical eigenvalue distribution of the unitary random matrix $u(P(N), Q(N))$ and the rate function I_u is given in the same way as in Theorem 4.1.

In this way, for concrete applications, it remains only to find an explicit form of the rate function I_h (or I_u) as well as that of the minimizer μ_0 . We present a few examples in the rest of the section.

Example 4.3. Consider $h = ef + fe \in \mathcal{A}$ and let $\tau = (\{\alpha_{ij}\}_{i,j=0}^1, \mu) \in TS(\mathcal{A})$ as in Section 3. Since $e(t)f(t) + f(t)e(t)$ has the eigenvalues $t \pm \sqrt{t}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\varphi(ef + fe)) &= (\alpha_{10} + \alpha_{01} + \alpha_{00})\varphi(0) + \alpha_{11}\varphi(2) \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \sum_{i,j=0}^1 \alpha_{ij}\right) \int_0^1 \frac{\varphi(t + \sqrt{t}) + \varphi(t - \sqrt{t})}{2} d\mu(t) \end{aligned}$$

for every continuous function φ on $\mathbb{R}$. By this expression and (3.4), whenever τ satisfies (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{ef+fe}(\tau) &= \max\{|\alpha - \beta|, 1 - 2\alpha, 1 - 2\beta\}\delta_0 + \max\{\alpha + \beta - 1\}\delta_2 \\ &\quad + \rho(\mu \circ S^{-1} + \mu \circ T^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where $S : (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, 2)$ and $T : (0, 1) \rightarrow [-1/4, 0)$ are given by $St := t + t\sqrt{t}$ and $Tt := t - \sqrt{t}$. Hence the empirical eigenvalue distribution of $P(N)Q(N) + Q(N)P(N)$ satisfies the large deviation in the scale $1/N^2$ and the good rate function $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$ for $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ is given by (2.9) if $\tilde{\mu}$ is of the form in the right-hand side of (4.1) with $\mu \in \mathcal{M}((0, 1))$; otherwise $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu}) = +\infty$. The minimizer of $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$ is the right-hand side of (4.1) with $\mu = \mu_0$, where $\rho\mu_0$ is the continuous part of the measure (2.10).

Example 4.4. Consider $h = ae + bf$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Since $ae(t) + bf(t)$ has the eigenvalues $\frac{1}{2}(a + b \pm \sqrt{(a - b)^2 + 4abt})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\varphi(ae + bf)) &= \alpha_{00}\varphi(0) + \alpha_{10}\varphi(a) + \alpha_{01}\varphi(b) + \alpha_{11}\varphi(a + b) \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \sum_{i,j=0}^1 \alpha_{ij}\right) \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2} \left(\varphi\left(\frac{a + b - \sqrt{(a - b)^2 + 4abt}}{2}\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \varphi\left(\frac{a + b + \sqrt{(a - b)^2 + 4abt}}{2}\right) \right) d\mu(t) \end{aligned}$$

for every continuous function φ on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\tau = (\{\alpha_{ij}\}_{i,j=0}^1, \mu) \in TS(\mathcal{A})$. Let A, B be the first two smallest numbers of $0, a, b, a + b$, and define $S : (0, 1) \rightarrow (A, B)$ and $T : (0, 1) \rightarrow (a + b - B, a + b - A)$ by

$$St := \frac{a + b - \sqrt{(a - b)^2 + 4abt}}{2}, \quad Tt := \frac{a + b + \sqrt{(a - b)^2 + 4abt}}{2}.$$

When τ satisfies (3.2), the above expression shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{ae+bf}(\tau) &= \max\{1 - \alpha - \beta, 0\}\delta_0 + \max\{\alpha - \beta, 0\}\delta_a \\ &\quad + \max\{\beta - \alpha, 0\}\delta_b + \max\{\alpha + \beta - 1, 0\}\delta_{a+b} \\ &\quad + \rho(\mu \circ S^{-1} + \mu \circ T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the empirical eigenvalue distribution of $aP(N) + bQ(N)$ satisfies the large deviation and the good rate function as well as its minimizer is determined similarly to the above example.

Let us express the rate function $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$ and the minimizer $\tilde{\mu}_0$ more explicitly. When $\mu \in \mathcal{M}((0, 1))$, the measure $\nu := \frac{1}{2}(\mu \circ S^{-1} + \mu \circ T^{-1})$ is supported in $(A, B) \cup (a + b - B, a + b - A)$ and symmetric at $(a + b)/2$ so that $\mu = 2\nu \circ S|_{(A, B)} = 2\nu \circ T|_{(a+b-B, a+b-A)}$. Since $St = x$ (or $Tt = x$) implies $t = (x - a)(x - b)/ab$, we get

$$\int_0^1 \log t d\mu(t) = 2 \int_A^B \log \frac{(x - a)(x - b)}{ab} d\nu(x) = 2 \int_{a+b-B}^{a+b-A} \log \frac{(x - a)(x - b)}{ab} d\nu(x)$$

so that

$$\int_0^1 \log t \, d\mu(t) = \int_{(A,B) \cup (a+b-B, a+b-A)} \log \frac{(x-a)(x-b)}{ab} \, d\nu(x).$$

Similarly,

$$\int_0^1 \log(1-t) \, d\mu(t) = \int_{(A,B) \cup (a+b-B, a+b-A)} \log \frac{x(a+b-x)}{ab} \, d\nu(x).$$

On the other hand, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(\mu) &= 4 \int_A^B \int_A^B \log \left| \frac{(x-a)(x-b)}{ab} - \frac{(y-a)(y-b)}{ab} \right| \, d\nu(x) \, d\nu(y) \\ &= 4 \int_A^B \int_A^B \log \left| \frac{(x-a)(a+b-x-y)}{ab} \right| \, d\nu(x) \, d\nu(y) \\ &= 2\Sigma(\nu) - \log |ab|. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the rate function $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu})$ is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu}) &= -2\rho^2 \Sigma(\nu) - \rho|\alpha - \beta| \int_{(A,B) \cup (a+b-B, a+b-A)} \log |(x-a)(x-b)| \, d\nu(x) \\ &\quad - \rho|\alpha + \beta - 1| \int_{(A,B) \cup (a+b-B, a+b-A)} \log |x(a+b-x)| \, d\nu(x) \\ &\quad + C + \rho \max\{\alpha, \beta, 1-\alpha, 1-\beta\} \log |ab| \end{aligned}$$

if $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu} &= \max\{1-\alpha-\beta, 0\} \delta_0 + \max\{\alpha-\beta, 0\} \delta_a \\ &\quad + \max\{\beta-\alpha, 0\} \delta_b + \max\{\alpha+\beta-1, 0\} \delta_{a+b} + 2\rho\nu \end{aligned}$$

with $\nu \in \mathcal{M}((A, B) \cup (a+b-B, a+b-A))$ symmetric at $(a+b)/2$; otherwise $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu}) = +\infty$.

Moreover, by transforming the continuous part of (2.10), the explicit form of the minimizer $\tilde{\mu}_0$ can be easily computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_0 &= \max\{1-\alpha-\beta, 0\} \delta_0 + \max\{\alpha-\beta, 0\} \delta_a \\ &\quad + \max\{\beta-\alpha, 0\} \delta_b + \max\{\alpha+\beta-1, 0\} \delta_{a+b} \\ &\quad + \frac{|x - \frac{a+b}{2}| \sqrt{-(x-A_0)(x-B_0)(x-a-b+B_0)(x-a-b+A_0)}}{\pi |x(x-a)(x-b)(x-a-b)|} \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}_{(A_0, B_0) \cup (a+b-B_0, a+b-A_0)}(x) \, dx, \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$A_0 := \frac{a+b - \sqrt{(a-b)^2 + 4ab\eta}}{2}, \quad B_0 := \frac{a+b - \sqrt{(a-b)^2 + 4ab\xi}}{2}$$

(or exchange A_0, B_0 depending on the sign of ab) with ξ, η in (2.11). As is guaranteed by the asymptotic freeness ([15]) of $(P(N), Q(N))$, the minimizer $\tilde{\mu}_0$ is equal to the distribution of $ap + bq$ where (p, q) is a pair of free projections in a tracial W^* -probability space $(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ with $\tau(p) = \alpha$ and $\tau(q) = \beta$. In fact, the distribution was computed in [1] by use of R -transform.

Although one can prove the large deviation result for the empirical eigenvalue density of $aP(N) + bQ(N)$ (also $P(N)Q(N) + Q(N)P(N)$) based on the joint eigenvalue distributions given in Corollary 1.3, our stress is that this is just a particular case of grand Theorem 4.1 (or Theorem 3.2).

Example 4.5. For unitaries we consider a simple example $u = e^{i\pi e} e^{-i\pi f}$. Since the eigenvalues of $e^{i\pi e(t)} e^{-i\pi f(t)}$ are $2t - 1 \pm 2i\sqrt{t(1-t)} = e^{\pm i\theta(t)}$ where $\theta(t) := \cos^{-1}(2t - 1)$ for $t \in (0, 1)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\varphi(u)) &= (\alpha_{11} + \alpha_{00})\varphi(1) + (\alpha_{10} + \alpha_{01})\varphi(-1) \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \sum_{i,j=0}^1 \alpha_{ij}\right) \int_0^1 \frac{\varphi(e^{i\theta(t)}) + \varphi(e^{-i\theta(t)})}{2} d\mu(t) \end{aligned}$$

for every continuous function φ on $\mathbb{T}$ and $\tau = (\{\alpha_{ij}\}_{i,j=0}^1, \mu) \in TS(\mathcal{A})$. When τ satisfies (3.2), this implies that

$$\lambda_u(\tau) = |\alpha + \beta - 1|\delta_1 + |\alpha - \beta|\delta_{-1} + \rho(\mu \circ \theta^{-1} + \mu \circ \tilde{\theta}^{-1}),$$

where $\tilde{\theta}(t) := -\theta(t)$ for $t \in (0, 1)$. For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}((0, 1))$ let $\nu := \frac{1}{2}(\mu \circ \theta^{-1} + \mu \circ \tilde{\theta}^{-1})$, which is a probability measure on $\mathbb{T}$ symmetric for the real axis. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \log t d\mu(t) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log \frac{1 + \cos \theta}{2} d\nu(e^{i\theta}), \\ \int_0^1 \log(1 - t) d\mu(t) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{2} d\nu(e^{i\theta}), \end{aligned}$$

$$\Sigma(\mu) = \iint_{\mathbb{T}^2} \log |\cos \theta - \cos \psi| d\nu(e^{i\theta}) d\nu(e^{i\psi}) - \log 2.$$

Hence we see by Remark 4.2 that the empirical eigenvalue distribution of $e^{i\pi P(N)} e^{-i\pi Q(N)}$ satisfies the large deviation in the scale $1/N^2$ and the rate function is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}(\tilde{\mu}) &= -\rho^2 \iint_{\mathbb{T}^2} \log |\cos \theta - \cos \psi| d\nu(e^{i\theta}) d\nu(e^{i\psi}) \\ &\quad - \rho|\alpha - \beta| \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log(1 + \cos \theta) d\nu(e^{i\theta}) - \rho|\alpha + \beta - 1| \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log(1 - \cos \theta) d\nu(e^{i\theta}) \\ &\quad + C + \rho \max\{\alpha, \beta, 1 - \alpha, 1 - \beta\} \log 2 \end{aligned}$$

if $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T})$ is of the form $\tilde{\mu} = |\alpha + \beta - 1|\delta_1 + |\alpha - \beta|\delta_{-1} + 2\rho\nu$ with $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T})$ having no atoms at ± 1 and symmetric for the real axis; otherwise $\tilde{I}(\tilde{\nu}) = +\infty$. The minimizer $\tilde{\mu}_0$ is also easy to compute as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_0 &= |\alpha + \beta - 1|\delta_1 + |\alpha - \beta|\delta_{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{\sqrt{-(\cos \theta + 1 - 2\xi)(\cos \theta + 1 - 2\eta)}}{|\sin \theta|} \mathbf{1}_{(\theta_1, \theta_2) \cup (-\theta_2, -\theta_1)}(\theta) \frac{d\theta}{2\pi}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where $\theta_1 := \cos^{-1}(2\eta - 1)$ and $\theta_2 := \cos^{-1}(2\xi - 1)$. This measure is the distribution of $e^{i\pi p} e^{-i\pi q}$ for free projections p, q sometimes mentioned above. It may be natural that this distribution is rather different (except the same atomic parts) from that of $e^{i\pi(p-q)}$ computed from (4.2). In particular, when $\alpha = \beta = 1/2$ so that $\xi = 0$ and $\eta = 1$, the minimizer (4.3) is the uniform measure on $\mathbb{T}$ but (4.2) induces the arcsine law on the angular variable $(-\pi, \pi)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. AKIYAMA AND H. YOSHIDA, The orthogonal polynomials for a linear sum of a free family of projections, *Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top.* **2** (1999), 627–643.
- [2] G. BEN AROUS AND A. GUIONNET, Large deviation for Wigner’s law and Voiculescu’s non-commutative entropy, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **108**, (1997), 517–542.
- [3] J. ANDERSON, B. BLACKADAR AND U. HAAGERUP, Minimal projections in the reduced group C^* -algebra of $\mathbb{Z}_n * \mathbb{Z}_m$, *J. Operator Theory* **26** (1991), 3–23.
- [4] B. COLLINS, Product of random projections, Jacobi ensembles and universality problems arising from free probability, Preprint, arXiv: math.PR/0406560, 2004.
- [5] A. G. CONSTANTINE, Some non-central distribution problems in multivariate analysis, *Ann. Math. Statist.* **34** (1963), 1270–1285.
- [6] A. DEMBO AND O. ZEITOUNI, *Large Deviation Techniques and Applications*, Second edition, Springer, New York, 1998.
- [7] P. J. FORRESTER, *Log-Gases and Random Matrices*, Chapter 2, Book manuscript, <http://www.ms.unimelb.edu.au/~matpjf/matpjf.html>, 2004.
- [8] A. GUIONNET, Large deviations and stochastic calculus for large random matrices, preprint, 2004.
- [9] F. HIAI AND D. PETZ, *The Semicircle Law, Free Random Variables and Entropy*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Vol. 77, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2000.
- [10] F. HIAI AND Y. UEDA, In preparation.
- [11] M. L. MEHTA, *Random Matrices*, Second edition, Academic Press, Boston, 1991.
- [12] D. PETZ AND J. RÉFFY, Large deviation theorem for empirical eigenvalue density of truncated Haar unitary matrices, *Prob. Theory Rel. Fields.*, to appear.
- [13] E. B. SAFF AND V. TOTIK, *Logarithmic Potentials with External Fields*, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1997.
- [14] M. TAKESAKI, *Theory of Operator Algebras I*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg-Berlin, 1979.
- [15] D. VOICULESCU, Limit laws for random matrices and free products, *Invent. Math.* **104** (1991), 201–220.
- [16] D. VOICULESCU, The analogues of entropy and of Fisher’s information measure in free probability theory, I, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **155** (1993), 71–92.
- [17] D. VOICULESCU, The analogue of entropy and of Fisher’s information measure in free probability theory VI: Liberation and mutual free information, *Adv. Math.* **146** (1999), 101–166.
- [18] D. V. VOICULESCU, K. J. DYKEMA AND A. NICA, *Free Random Variables*, CRM Monograph Ser., Vol. 1, Amer. Math. Soc., 1992.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF INFORMATION SCIENCES, TOHOKU UNIVERSITY, AOBA-KU, SENDAI 980-8579, JAPAN

ALFRÉD RÉNYI INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, H-1053 BUDAPEST, REÁLTANODA U. 13-15, HUNGARY